



PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF CRIME PREVENTION AND STRATEGIES USED BY POLICE – A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN THREE SOUTHERN STATES

Kalyan kumar Alladi

Research scholar, Rakshashakti university, Ahmedabad

Dr. K.B.Kumar

Director, AIBHAS, Amity University, Noida

Dr. S.L.Vaya

Director, Institute of Research and Development, Raksha Shakti University, Ahmedabad

ABSTRACT

The current study investigates the public perception of the police and crime prevention strategies used by the police in three southern states of India (Karnataka, Andhrapradesh, and Telangana). The participants selected for the study were 800. The subjects were contacted and administered the questionnaire. Perception of crime prevention questionnaire was the major instrument used for the data collection. Stratified random sampling was employed through personal interview. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between three states in the public perception of police and crime prevention strategies used by police.

KEYWORDS : Public perception of police, Crime prevention strategies

INTRODUCTION

Crime prevention is the challenge to reduce and prevent crime and criminal behavior in partnership with the community. Crime prevention requires understanding and responding to both the cause and the crime. Crime deterrence is achieved when police react to a crime matter before it becomes a significant crime crisis and decrease the need to repeatedly respond to similar incidents. Police and communities work together with other partners to understand the problem and implement local solutions. Intervention occurs which prevents or reduces crime that may have occurred if that intervention did not take place.

Government, industry and community partnerships are the key to the delivery of crime prevention in a situational or social approach. Police acknowledge that other agencies with expertise provide a range of actions and services such as education programs, child protection, housing services and counseling that police support and promote to address social crime.

Policing and crime reduction: Much police work is reactive and incident-focused rather than proactive and strategic. Hard work to shift policing towards a more efficient and sustainable move toward crime reduction have been a small number of and far connecting. Although the police do much more than fight crime – responding to civil emergencies, maintaining order and even undertaking 'social work' – they still constitute the front line in tackling crime. And there is now a considerable body of evidence on how effective they are at doing so, which this paper summarizes. Traditionally, the police have favored a law enforcement approach to crime control based on the theory of deterrence. The crime prevention is manifested through random patrols, emergency response, stop and search, investigation and detection and intensive enforcement, all of which still dominate contemporary policing activity. Evidence from research, however, suggests these strategies are relatively ineffectual in reducing crime and detecting offenders.

Popular perceptions of what the police do tend to focus on their role in responding to a constant stream of emergency calls, mostly from the public. As an emergency service, the police respond to calls 24/7 on a case-by-case basis, deal with each one individually. Generally termed 'response policing', it focuses on the here and now, provided that instant help to victims and eye-catching suspects. It constitutes what police personnel often refer to as 'real' policing. Although response policing constitutes the 'bread and butter' of everyday policing, there is in fact virtually no evidence on its effects on crime (Committee on Law and Justice, 2004). Considerable research has been undertaken in the past to establish the degree to which the police spend their time directly responding to or preventing crime

(see, for example, Bittner, 1990).

Research on the role of the police has consistently highlighted their wider mandate and service function in order maintenance more generally (for example crowd control, responding to emergencies etc.) and the amount of time they spend on front line, public-facing activities. A recent National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) study of neighborhood and response teams in the UK found that public-facing work in the community accounted for about 44 per cent of officers' time. This incorporated responding to incidents, intriguing statements, foot watch and community engagement. Administrative work accounted for nearly a third of officer time and a further quarter of their time was spent in the custody suite or at court, in training, briefings or meetings, travelling or on breaks (McLean and Hillier, 2010).

In India the research related to public perception of crime prevention is very limited; the present study is trying to finding the crime prevention strategies used by police part of "public perception of police performance" in three southern states of India.

METHOD

The study was carried out in the southern states of India included Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Telangana state and four zones of each state was surveyed. The population of the study included skilled, semiskilled and unskilled persons in the study areas.

Objectives of the present study

1. Understanding the perception of public towards police regarding crime prevention and strategies
2. Find out the comparison between the three states in public perception of crime prevention and strategies used by police

Sample

Stratified random sampling was used in the survey. Proportionate allocation method was used in each strata, and total of 800 citizens in three states (N=400) was taken. The sample collected on the basis of four zones of each state (North, South, West and East), each zone 100 sample were drawn Karnataka (N=400), and 50 from the rest of the two states (N=400-Andhrapradesh -200+Telangana state-200). The sample includes the various categories of public like skilled, semi skilled and unskilled.

Tools

Socio-demographic data sheet

The socio-demographic data sheet was used to record the relevant

information of the participants; it includes age, gender, education, occupation, income, marital status, religion, domicile, family type. This pro-forma developed for the current study by the researcher.

Opinion on crime prevention and enforcement strategies

The tool used for the current study was "Opinion on crime prevention and enforcement strategies" this was designed and developed for the sole purpose of this survey after reviewing the tool already employed in the previous field surveys. It assesses the following domains- public satisfaction with investigating crime, public satisfaction with addressing crime prevention including cruiser patrol, victim assistance. This measure consists of 8 items with four responses. The sample question used for the survey is "Police personnel and their efforts are helpful to reduce crime and keep neighborhoods safe" the responses are 1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

Statistical Analysis

The statistical package for social science (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. The descriptive Statistics (frequency distribution), ANOVA, Post Hoc Tests were the statistical analysis done.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this research 800 citizens were selected through stratified random sampling and conducted Personal interview. Intercept and door-to-door type of personal interview was also administered.

Table-1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study population (n=800)

Variable	Category	KA (Freq & %)	AP	TS
		N=400	N=200	N=200
Sex	Male	263(65.8)	130 (65.0)	122(61.1)
	Female	137(34.2)	70 (35.0)	78(39%)
Occupation	Skilled	220 (55.0)	129 (64.5)	117 (58.5)
	Semiskilled	121 (30.2)	36 (18.0)	52 (26.0)
	Unskilled	59 (14.8)	35 (17.5)	31 (15.5)
Marital Status	Married	274 (68.5)	158 (79.0)	137 (68.5)
	Single	113(28.2)	41 (20.5)	52 (26.0)
Religion	Hindu	270 (67.5)	150 (75.0)	102 (51.0)
	Muslim	58 (14.5)	21 (10.5)	61 (30.5)
	Christian	61 (15.2)	28 (14.0)	36 (18.0)
Family	Nuclear	252 (63.0)	107 (53.5)	134 (67.0)
	Joint	137 (34.2)	88 (44.0)	59 (29.5)
	Extended	11 (2.8)	5 (2.5)	7 (3.5)
Domicile	Urban	246 (61.5)	139 (69.5)	108 (54.0)
	Rural	154 (38.5)	61 (30.5)	92 (46.05)

The "Socio-demographic data sheet" and another measure which consists of "Opinion on crime prevention and enforcement strategies" designed by the researcher to elicit information pertain to various zones of public includes in the three southern states of India. The information Collected from the public was later analyzed and the outcomes indicated the following:

Findings on the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents show that their mean age is 36.05 with a standard deviation of 11.75. This implies that majority of the respondents are middle- aged adults who must have dealings with police at least once. In education back ground of the respondents were having

minimum education in years of 14.56 mean and having standard deviation of 2.9. The gender of Participants reveal a disproportionate representation, where male accounted for 64% of the respondents and female respondents constituted 36% of the respondents. This presents a ratio of 2:1 across the gender group skewed in favor of male. On marital status nearly seven (7) out of 10 respondents, that is (71%) were married while the remaining (29%) were either single, Separated from their spouses, divorced or widowed. A significant proportion 58.2% of the respondents are falling under skilled occupation comparatively semiskilled 26% and unskilled 15%. From the income level within three southern states upper low socio economical status group were the predominant with 40%. Data on respondent's religious affiliation depict that majority (65.2%) were Hindus, 17.5% were Muslims, 15% were Christians and while the rest (1%) belong to other religion. A significant finding of Hindu religion was found among the respondents.

Test Variables

The following tables showed the mean differences of perception of crime prevention in three southern states of India.

Table-2a: Descriptives for variables of three southern states and perception of crime prevention

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Karnataka	400	17.40	5.000	0.250
Andhra Pradesh	200	16.77	4.094	0.289
Telangana State	200	19.28	5.799	0.410
Total	800	17.71	5.091	0.180

Table- 2b: ANOVA for the variables of three southern states and perception of crime prevention

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	708.761	2	354.381	14.121	0.000
Within groups	20001.538	798	25.096		
Total	20710.299	800			

From the table 2a the findings indicating that 400 citizen's perception of crime prevention that are from Karnataka had a mean of 17.40 and for 200 citizens perception of crime prevention that are from Andhrpradesh had a mean of 16.77. As for the Telangana state the mean was high 19.28. From the ANOVA table, the F-ratio was F (2,798)= 14.121, p<0.001, implied that there was a statistically highly significant difference of the mean scores of perception of crime prevention among three southern states.

Table-2c. Comparison between public perception of crime prevention and strategies used by police among three southern states, Karnataka(KA), Andrapradesh (AP) and Telangana State (TS) of India.

			Mean difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Crime Prevention	KA	AP	0.628	0.434	0.352
		TS	-1.883*	0.434	0.000
	AP	KA	-0.628	0.434	0.352
		TS	-2.510*	0.501	0.000
	TS	KA	1.883*	0.434	0.000
		AP	2.510*	0.501	0.000

*.The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The table 2c, indicating that significant value for Telangana state was 0.000, $p < 0.01$, so public perception of crime prevention in Telangana state is statistically significant from Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka citizens. There is no significant value for perception of crime prevention in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. In other words public perception of police and crime prevention in Telangana state is significantly differ from rest of the two southern states, but the Karnataka states citizens perception is not significantly differ from Andhra Pradesh.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Findings are discussed in relation to the public perception of the police and crime prevention in the three southern states of India. In the study, a significant majority of the public from Telangana state described the perceived relationship between them and police is very poor and the perception of crime prevention is very low, that means they expressed less police raids in the state, through media also public perceived police are doing poor performance against crime comparatively other two southern states of India. This finding mirrored the view of that the police image in Telangana state requires to be rebranded and this can only be possible when police personnel as individuals have a new orientation about the function of the police in the state. The police insensitivity to the plight of the public community they are policing has not allowed for smooth relationship between them and the public at large.

Empirical evidence from the study did confirm the public perception of police personnel in Telanagana are not helpful to reduce crime and keep neighborhoods safe, not showing any impact on crime and antisocial behavior and also their team on patrol is very rare, they are not tackling issues very effectively, overall amount of crime in the state is high and public were not much satisfied with the police investigations about crime in their local area.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

From the findings of this study have led to the following recommendations: The public perception of the crime prevention and strategies used by police personnel can be changed if the police personnel changed their work pattern and use effective strategies. In addition to it if the police are goes for constant raids in the city/state, deliver effective services in relation with the crime prevention and helpful to reduce crime and keep the state safe. Overall the police should work relentlessly towards redeeming their public image of underperforming, immodest brutality and use of predatory force and ineffective policing strategies.

REFERENCES

- 1) Alemika EEO (2012) Rethinking crime prevention and crime control approaches in Nigeria. *Journal of the Nigerian Sociological Society* 2:7-10
- 2) Angela K.P. Chan and Vanessa M.S. Chan (2012) Public perception of crime and attitude towards police- Examining the effects of media news. *Discovery – SS Student E-Journal* 1:215-237
- 3) Bennett, R. R. and Flavin, JM (1994) A Determinant of Fear of Crime: The Effect of Cultural Setting. *Justice Quarterly* 11:357–381
- 4) Dennis Rosenbaum, Amie Schuck; Lisa Graziano ; Cody Stephens (2008) Measuring Police and Community Performance Using Web-Based Surveys: Findings from the Chicago Internet Project, This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice
- 5) Garcia V, Cao LQ(2005). Race and satisfaction with police in a small city. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 33:191-199
- 6) Fiona McLean, Joe Hillier (2010) An observational study of response and neighborhood officers- Research, Analysis and Information and Ipsos MORI
- 7) Johnson Olusegun Ajayi (2015) Public Perception of the Police and Crime- Prevention in Nigeria *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioral Science* 6:145-153
- 8) Suryati Ishak, (2016) Perceptions of People on Police Efficiency and Crime Prevention in Urban Areas in Malaysia. *Economics World Journal* 4:243-248
- 9) Seiji Shibata, Kazunori Hanyu, Tatsuto Asakawa, Takahito Shimada & Kenji Omata (2011) People's Crime Perception, and Attitude toward Community Crime Prevention Activities in Japan, *Journal of Asian Behavioral Studies*
- 10) Warr M (2000) Fear of Crime in the United States: Avenues for Research and Policy. *Criminal Justice* 4:451–489